

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the abstract has been revised to comply with the rules and, further, claims 1 and 8-13 have been cancelled and new claims 14-21 have been added. Claims 2-7 and 14-21 are pending herein and under consideration.

Support for the amended and new claims may be found for example at page 5, line 30- page 7, line 24 of the specification.

No new matter is presented, and accordingly, approval and entry of the amended and new claims are respectfully requested.

Item 1: Objection to Abstract

In accordance with the foregoing, the Abstract has been deleted in its entirety and replaced with a new Abstract and is now in compliance with the rules. Approval and entry of same is respectfully requested.

Item 2: Objection to claim 13

Claim 13 has been cancelled and thus the objection is moot.

Item 3: Rejection of Claims 1-8 for anticipation by Mital in view of Claus

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

On a first basis, the preamble portion of Item 3 and its heading both assert obviousness rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, whereas the rejection stated at page 3 is for anticipation of claims 1-8 by Mital in view of Claus - - the grounds of rejection being inconsistent with an anticipation rejection. Accordingly, Applicants are responding on the basis that the Examiner intended the rejection of claims 1-8 to be for obviousness (§ 103) over the combination of the two references.

It is submitted that neither of the references teaches or suggest the features set forth in any of the newly presented, independent claims 14-21 herein and, thus, that each thereof and the dependent claims 2-4 and 7, now amended to be dependent from variously, claim 14 and claim 16, patentably distinguish thereover and are allowable.

More particularly, Mital teaches the encrypting and decrypting of documents by use of a public key and a private key and the technology of electronic signature. Mital fails to teach the

feature commonly set forth in the newly submitted independent claims 14-21, that identical transaction keys are selected on screens of the terminal devices, and the different matching keys are generated based on the identical transaction keys.

Claus teaches transmitting the security key of a first smart card to a second smart card and matching, in the second smart card, the security key transmitted from the first smart card against the security key of the second smart card. A proper match enables the second smart card to be usable for transactions.

In this manner, with Claus's system, matching is performed in a smart card. In the invention, as set forth in the newly submitted independent claims 14-21, the matching of the matching keys is always performed at, and by, an authentication system.

Further, with Claus's system, the security key is issued upon an authentication using a PIN (Fig. 5A, column 11, line 54 to column 12, line 62), and does not correspond to a specific transaction. Moreover, in accordance with the invention as defined by the newly submitted independent claims 14-21, the matching keys are generated based on the transaction keys, and are issued if identical transaction keys are selected on screens of the terminal devices/user apparatuses and only if each of the users satisfies the conditions required for conducting the prospective transaction.

Whereas each of Mital and Claus has been shown in the foregoing to be unrelated to the authentication system, method and program of the present invention, Applicants further submit that the proposed combination of the teachings of the two references is not supported in the Action by any prima facie demonstration of obviousness of that combination. Indeed, the Action at pages 3-4 merely advances merely the contention that the modification of Mital in accordance with Claus would have been obviousness to "a person having ordinary skill in the art..." without satisfying any of the conditions required to support such a combination as set forth in MPEP 2143-2143.03.

Conclusion

It is submitted that the pending claims have been shown to distinguish patentably over the references of record taken singularly or in any proper combination and, there being no other objections or rejections, that the application is in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested

Docket No.: 1614.1127

Serial No. 09/788,389


to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Aug. 15, 2005

By: 
H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501